

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 9-10, 17-20, and 22-28 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim. Claims 17-20 and 22-26 have been withdrawn from consideration as directed to a non-elected species.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 9-10, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over WO 00/44841 to Nagahama et al. ("Nagahama") in view of US 5,886,819 to Murata et al. ("Murata"), and claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Nagahama in view of Murata and further in view of US 6,111,699 to Iwata et al. ("Iwata").

The rejections are respectfully traversed. Murata and Nagahama do not provide any teaching, suggestion or motivation regarding a temporary protective film as used in the presently claimed invention.

Specifically, the antiglare film of Murata is integral with a polarizer to form part of the optical member which is integrated into the display of Murata. In particular, the antiglare film is not used temporarily for protection of an optical member during transportation and storage, but is permanently attached to the adjacent optical layer.

As a result, the antiglare film of Murata is completely different from a protective film as in the presently claimed invention, which comprises a protective base and an adhesive layer disposed on the protective base so that the protective base can be released together with the adhesive layer from the optical material, as recited in present claim 1.

In addition, contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, it would not have been obvious to use such surface roughness on the removable protective film of Nagahama "to ease or simplify inspection of the underlying attached optical material (e.g. a polarizer element) due to a relatively

higher contrast, while reducing or eliminating possible glittering effects during viewing” (Office Action at page 4, end of first paragraph), because Murata focuses on the antiglare properties of a display, i.e., after the polarizing film is mounted in the finished product, so that Murata does not provide any motivation to have the antiglare surface on a temporary protective film that will be removed at the time of assembling the polarizing film into a display.

The fact that Murata shows no interest in improving antiglare effect on a temporary protective layer, but focuses exclusively on the antiglare and anti-glitter effect on a mounted display, is immediately apparent from the following statements of Murata:

- Col. 1, lines 43-46: “it is eagerly desired to develop an efficient antiglare means on the display screen which prevents imaging reflection of external light sources such as the sun, fluorescent lamps and the like on the display screens” (emphasis added)
- Col. 2, lines 17-24: “The object of the present invention is accordingly to provide a novel and improved display exhibiting an excellent antiglare effect by preventing imaging reflection of external light sources such as the sun, fluorescent lamps and the like on the imaging screen of the display and capable of giving sharp display images of high resolution without glittering and also to provide an antiglare material suitable for use on a full-color display screen” (emphasis added)
- Col. 7, lines 27-31: The thus formed antiglare material of the invention exhibits an excellent antiglare effect and, when mounted on an image display such as CRTs and LCDs, serves to give a sharp image with high resolution and high contrast without glittering” (emphasis added)

- Col. 7, lines 31-35: “In addition, the polarizing film by the use of such an antiglare material is useful as an image display such as liquid crystal panels and the like because of the good antiglare effect and the excellent image contrast without glittering exhibited thereby” (emphasis added)

These statements, taken individually or together, teach away from providing an antiglare treatment on a removable protective film.

In addition, Murata evaluates an antiglare and antiglittering effect only in the context of a display, so that Murata does not provide any guidance as to the interest and the evaluation of an antiglare effect or antiglittering effect of a temporary protective layer on the polarizing film before assembly:

- Col. 8, lines 60-63: “Evaluation of the image contrast was undertaken according to the procedure specified in JIS C7072-1988 for the testing method of the contrast ratio (CR) of liquid crystal display panels” (emphasis added)
- Col. 9, lines 10-17: “Glittering of the images due to moiré-image fringes was evaluated in an organoleptic method by the visual inspection undertaken by 100 panel members in which the liquid crystal display 30 was connected to a personal computer... and each of the panel members was requested to visually detect appearance of glittering” (emphasis added)
- Col. 9, lines 21-27: “Antiglare effect was evaluated also in an organoleptic method by the visual inspection undertaken by 100 panel members, in which each of the panel members was requested to find imaging reflection of his or her own face under lighting with a 40 watts fluorescent lamp when he or she faced the liquid crystal display in a black-exhibiting condition perpendicularly at a distance of 50 cm” (emphasis added)

Thus, the focus of the antiglare film of Murata is the antiglare properties in a display, and there is absolutely no indication in Murata whether antiglare properties on a temporary protective film might be of any benefit or, on the contrary, a disturbance.

In summary, none of the cited references provides a suggestion or motivation to adapt any optical properties of an antiglare film as in Murata to a temporary protective film as in Nagahama, let alone . Therefore, the present claims are not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

Further, examination of all claims in this application is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial Number: 10/015,991

Group Art Unit: 2872

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No.: 020606

Customer No.: 38834

1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 822-1100

Fax: (202) 822-1111

NES:rep